United Nations A/67/181

General Assembly

Distr.: General
25 July 2012
English
Original: Arabic/English/Russian/
Spanish

Sixty-seventh session
Item 70 (b) of the provisional agenda*
Promotion and protection of human rights: human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report is submitted in accordance with General Assembly resolution 66/156, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to bring the resolution to the attention of all Member States, to continue to collect their views and information on the implications and negative effects of unilateral coercive measures on their populations and to submit an analytical report thereon to the Assembly at its sixty-seventh session. The present report contains a summary and analysis of the submissions received from the Governments of Andorra, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kuwait, Mexico, the Syrian Arab Republic and Trinidad and Tobago.

* A/67/150.

12-43955 (E) 210812

Please recycle

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Information received from Member States	3
	Andorra	3
	Belarus	3
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	5
	Cuba	5
	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8
	Jamaica	10
	Kuwait	10
	Mexico	11
	Syrian Arab Republic	11
	Trinidad and Tobago	12
III.	Analysis and conclusions	13

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 66/156, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to bring the resolution to the attention of all Member States, to continue to collect their views and information on the implications and negative effects of unilateral coercive measures on their populations and to submit an analytical report thereon to the Assembly at its sixty-seventh session, while reiterating once again the need to highlight the practical and preventive measures in that respect.

2. On 20 April 2012, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) sent a request for information to all permanent missions to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva. As at 5 July 2012, it had received responses from the Governments of Andorra, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kuwait, Mexico, the Syrian Arab Republic and Trinidad and Tobago.

II. Information received from Member States

Andorra

[Original: English]
[21 May 2012]

Andorra strongly considers that unilateral coercive measures are contrary to international law, international humanitarian law, the Charter of the United Nations and the norms and principles governing peaceful relations among States. Unilateral coercive measures are a major obstacle to the implementation of human rights.

The Government of Andorra states that it does not adopt or implement, and consequently does not recognize or encourage the use of, economic, political or any other type of unilateral measures that are not in accordance with international law. Furthermore, it strongly condemns any unilateral coercive measure on the population and states that its population is currently not coerced or subordinated in the exercise of its sovereign rights by any other State.

Belarus

[Original: Russian]
[31 May 2012]

Belarus has repeatedly emphasized the inadmissibility of the use of coercive economic measures and believes that economic sanctions are a means of political pressure on a sovereign State. Belarus strongly condemns the use of economic sanctions by the United States of America and Western countries against other countries, as it creates artificial barriers to trade and limits bilateral cooperation. Furthermore, such unauthorized measures and actions by the United States and the European Union are even more unacceptable since they are being applied by developed countries against developing countries or countries in need of international assistance, contrary to international law and the internationally agreed development goals. Pursuant to those goals, developed countries made commitments

to provide financial and economic assistance to developing countries and facilitate their development.

Belarus states that unilateral sanctions, other means of economic pressure and coercive measures against individual sovereign States are counterproductive and may lead to tension in relationships between sovereign States. Belarus remains convinced that equal and mutually respectful dialogue is the only way to contribute to solving emerging disagreements.

The insufficient response of the United Nations to the actions taken by the United States and the European Union is allowing this group of countries to freely apply the practice of economic sanctions against other States and to use such practice as a means of subordinating independent policies of other States to their political ambitions, which are in contradiction with the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international covenants.

Belarus also notes that, as signatories to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (the Helsinki Final Act), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States pledged to refrain from any act of economic coercion designed to subordinate to their own interests the exercise by another participating State the rights inherent in its sovereignty. Belarus also notes that, in January 2011, the European Union renewed the economic sanctions suspended between 2008 and 2010 and, in March 2012, tightened those sanctions. Consequently, 243 individuals and 32 companies, including journalists, judges, head teachers, rectors of universities, doctors and businesses, are subject to sanctions. By imposing sanctions against Belarus, the European Union and the United States showed complete indifference to the fate of ordinary people working for the entities under sanction. Government social programmes financed from the revenues of those undertakings were also negatively affected.

Belarus fully supports General Assembly resolution 66/156 on human rights and unilateral coercive measures and believes that the United Nations, in particular OHCHR, should urge countries applying unilateral coercive measures against other countries to implement the resolution and promptly and publicly respond to the actions of the European Union and the United States, urging them to respect the human rights of citizens in sanctioned countries.

Belarus recalls that, on 25 May 2012, during her visit to Zimbabwe, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights expressed the view that the application of unilateral economic sanctions against Zimbabwe should stop, in the light of the impact of those sanctions on the rights of ordinary citizens. Belarus believes that the High Commissioner, the Secretary-General and other senior United Nations officials should make similar statements about the need to abolish unilateral coercive measures against all States under sanctions.

Belarus believes that it is necessary to consider the possibility of creating an effective mechanism within the United Nations system to monitor the adverse effects of unilateral coercive measures. In particular, Belarus considers it useful to create a special procedure under the Human Rights Council in relation to unilateral coercive measures.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

[Original: English]
[25 May 2012]

Bosnia and Herzegovina is deeply convinced that no State should use, or encourage other international actors to use, economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce other States to make them subordinate to that State or to a great Power. Bosnia and Herzegovina takes this position because unilateral coercive measures directly contradict the standards of public international law and humanitarian law and therefore constitute a flagrant violation of the international instruments signed and ratified by States Members of the United Nations, member States of the Council of Europe and member States of the European Union.

Human rights are interrelated, interdependent and conditional, meaning that they include, as a fundamental human right, the right to development through the support of free trade and movement of people, goods, capital and services. The principle of free passage, or "laissez passer", was conceived at the time of the French Revolution and is built into the foundations of the European Union. Bosnia and Herzegovina believes that restricting the right to development through the use of unilateral coercive measures greatly jeopardizes the human rights enshrined in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the numerous international instruments that it has signed and ratified.

Bosnia and Herzegovina notes that interference with free trade takes place at the expense of vulnerable populations in developing countries, including children, adolescents, women and the elderly. Unfortunately, unilateral coercive measures at the legislative, economic and political levels continue to prevail worldwide, significantly influencing the social situation in developing countries and the full exercise of human rights. Bosnia and Herzegovina is of the view that it is necessary to raise public awareness of the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures and the importance of respecting the standards and principles of both public and private international law in order to create friendly relations between countries and promote and protect human rights.

Bosnia and Herzegovina strongly supports the implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Development and invokes the principle under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights that in no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence. Bosnia and Herzegovina states that unilateral coercive measures are one-sided means of political force that directly conflict with the ideals of democratic States.

Cuba

[Original: Spanish]
[12 June 2012]

Cuba states that numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council and the Commission on Human Rights, in addition to political declarations approved at major international summits and conferences of the United

Nations, have ruled that the application of unilateral coercive economic measures is a violation of the Charter and of international law. The implementation of unilateral coercive measures as an instrument of political and economic coercion threatens the enjoyment of all human rights, beginning with the rights to life and independence, sovereignty and self-determination of peoples. The main victims of those measures are the people of the countries against which they are applied, especially the most vulnerable groups — children, women, older persons and persons with disabilities.

Cuba recalls that the General Assembly decided in its resolution 2131 (XX) that no State might use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights or to secure from it advantages of any kind. That position was endorsed in the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV).

Cuba expresses the view that it has been a victim of the application of unilateral coercive measures imposed by developed countries. It therefore attaches particular importance to the consideration of this matter by the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly. Cuba believes that the application of such measures has been a fundamental instrument of a policy of hostility and aggression by the United States against Cuba, seeking to destroy the political, economic and social system established by the sovereign will of the Cuban people.

The Government of Cuba is of the opinion that the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States against Cuba is the longest and most cruel system of unilateral sanctions that has been applied against any country or witnessed in the history of humankind. As laid down on 6 April 1960, the purpose of the economic, commercial and financial embargo is the destruction of the Cuban revolution.

Cuba maintains that the embargo constitutes an essential component of a policy of State terrorism deployed against Cuba by successive United States administrations, which, in a systematic, cumulative and inhumane way, has affected all Cuban people, regardless of age, sex, race, religion or social status. Cuba asserts that this policy qualifies as an act of genocide under subsection (c) of article II of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Cuba also qualifies the blockade as an act of war and a crime under international law.

Cuba refers to the Torricelli Act of 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act of 1996, which, it says, contain provisions that are contrary to the Charter and in violation of international law and World Trade Organization agreements. Through those laws of a markedly extraterritorial nature, the Government of the United States has strengthened and extended to third countries, their companies and citizens the application of the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed against Cuba for 50 years.

Notwithstanding the official rhetoric of the Government of the United States aimed at convincing international public opinion of positive changes in its policy, the embargo remains intact today. The policy continues to be applied rigorously, with the repressive political and administrative mechanisms for its implementation having been strengthened, in particular the persecution of commercial and financial

transactions by Cuba in the world. Trade with subsidiaries of United States companies in third countries continues to be impeded and investors from third countries with interests in Cuba are placed on a blacklist.

Cuba states that export and import of products and services from or to the United States market remain prohibited, along with the use of United States dollars in its international transactions. Cuba has been denied access to credit from subsidiary United States companies in third countries and from many international institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank. The Government of the United States remains attached to unacceptable conditionalities and interventionist requests as a condition for change in its policy towards Cuba.

Cuba notes that, in support of the blockade policy, sanctions governing transactions with Cuba continue to be applied against United States and European companies. This policy impedes exchanges of a scientific, cultural or tourist nature and promotes the theft of trademarks and the freezing of millions of dollars of Cuban funds in the United States. More pressure is applied to subordinate relations with Cuba for the purposes of regime change and financial support is offered for actions aimed at overthrowing the constitutional order in Cuba.

The damages caused by the extraterritorial nature of unilateral coercive measures are multiplied by the significant participation of the United States and its enterprises in trade and transnational investment. The investments of both third-country companies in the United States and of North American companies abroad, mainly in the form of mergers and partial or full acquisitions of companies, exacerbate the extraterritorial effects of those measures by reducing the external economic space of Cuba and make it more difficult, sometimes impossible, to find partners and suppliers to avoid the strict blockade imposed by the United States. More than 70 per cent of the Cuban population was born and lives subject to unilateral coercive measures applied by the Government of the United States against Cuba.

Cuba states that, according to conservative estimates, the direct damage to Cuba resulting from the blockade as at December 2010 exceeds $104 billion. Notwithstanding General Assembly resolution 66/6, adopted by an overwhelming majority of Member States on 25 October 2011, in which the Assembly called for the lifting of the economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba, and the existence of 19 previous resolutions that include that just demand, the Government of the United States has continued to pursue this action, evidencing its absolute disrespect for the United Nations, multilateralism and international law.

Over the past two years, there has been a significant imposition of fines on United States and foreign banks for having operated in Cuba. The persecution and surrender of individuals and companies in third countries have reached extreme levels, confirming the extraterritorial character of the blockade. Cuba provides numerous examples in this regard.

The application of this blockade policy continues to be the main obstacle to the economic and social development of Cuba and constitutes a flagrant, massive and systematic violation of human rights and a transgression of a sovereign State's rights to peace, development and security. The continued support of the international community and its strong pronouncement against the application of such measures has been an important tool in the struggle of the Cuban people.

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

[Original: English]
[5 June 2012]

The Islamic Republic of Iran recalls that, in recent decades, unilateral coercive measures have been imposed, mostly through unilateral economic and financial sanctions. It also recalls the illegitimacy of the practice, which is contrary to international law, international humanitarian law, the Charter and the norms and principles governing peaceful relations among States. The measures have drawn the attention of United Nations human rights bodies and mechanisms, in addition to non-governmental organizations, to the possible impact of economic and financial sanctions on the enjoyment of human rights.

For example, the Islamic Republic of Iran states that analysis of the issue of sanctions led the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to adopt its general comment No. 8 on the relationship between economic sanctions and respect for economic, social and cultural rights (E/C.12/1997/8), in which it said that economic sanctions almost always had a dramatic impact on the rights recognized in the Covenant and that they often caused significant disruption in the distribution of food, pharmaceuticals and sanitation supplies, jeopardized the quality of food and the availability of clean drinking water, severely interfered with the functioning of basic health and education systems, and undermined the right to work.

In the same general comment, it was stated that the collateral infliction of suffering upon the most vulnerable groups must be taken into account and that a number of recent United Nations and other studies had concluded that exemptions established by the Security Council to permit the flow of essential goods and services destined for humanitarian purposes did not have that effect and were limited in scope.[1] The Committee underlined that such exemptions did not address many required areas, such as the question of access to primary education, nor did they provide for repairs to infrastructure which were essential to provide clean water and adequate health care, among other things.

The Islamic Republic of Iran also points out that the Human Rights Committee, in its concluding observations on the fourth periodic report of Iraq, stated that the effect of sanctions had been to cause suffering and death, especially to children (CCPR/C/79/Add.84, para. 4). In 1999, considering the fourteenth periodic report of Iraq, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recalled that other human rights treaty monitoring bodies, such as the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (especially in its general comment No. 8), the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Human Rights Committee had recognized the adverse consequences of economic sanctions on the enjoyment of human rights by the civilian population and that, in its decision 1998/114, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had appealed to the international community, and to the Security Council in particular,

[1] In her report on the impact of armed conflict on children (A/51/306, annex), the expert of the Secretary-General states: "Humanitarian exemptions tend to be ambiguous and are interpreted arbitrarily and inconsistently ... Delays, confusion and the denial of requests to import essential humanitarian goods cause resources shortages ... [Their effects] inevitably fall most heavily on the poor."

for the embargo provisions affecting the humanitarian situation of the population to be lifted (see A/54/18, paras. 337-361).

The Islamic Republic of Iran also recalls the relevant resolutions and decisions of the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, as follows:

(a) In its resolution 1997/35, the Sub-Commission pointed out that economic sanctions most seriously affected the innocent population, in particular the weak and the poor, especially women and children, and had a tendency to aggravate the imbalances in income distribution already present in the countries concerned;

(b) In its decision 1999/110, the Sub-Commission reaffirmed that measures such as embargoes should be limited in time and in no way affect innocent civilian populations. In that context, it also underlined the need to respect the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and the two Additional Protocols thereto which prohibited the starving of civilian populations and the destruction of what was indispensable to their survival;

(c) In its resolution 2000/1 on human rights and humanitarian consequences of sanctions, including embargoes, the Sub-Commission appealed to the Commission on Human Rights to recommend to all competent organs, bodies and agencies of the United Nations system that they observe and implement all relevant provisions of human rights and international humanitarian law and to the Security Council that, as a first step, it alleviate sanctions regimes so as to eliminate their impact on the civilian population.

The Islamic Republic of Iran points out the need for urgent consideration of the human rights dimension in assessing the impact of economic sanctions on the population of countries under sanctions regimes. The living standards of large sections of the populations of targeted countries have been reduced to the subsistence level by the imposition of sanctions, which has also been a major obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Right to Development.

As confirmed at the recent thirty-seventh session of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation Council of Foreign Ministers, held in Dushanbe, the human cost of sanctions is a cause for genuine concern, and the deprivation suffered by civilian populations under sanctions regimes is a violation of human rights. Concerned over the implementation of such measures, the Islamic Republic of Iran condemns the continued imposition of economic sanctions by some Powers as tools of political or economic pressure against some developing countries, with a view to preventing those countries from exercising their right to decide, of their own free will, their own political, economic and social systems. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran appeals to all States concerned to reconsider the adoption of economic sanctions.

Jamaica

[Original: English]
[11 March 2011]

The Government of Jamaica has not adopted any unilateral measures that are not in accordance with international law or the Charter. Jamaica remains opposed to the adoption of such measures as they impede the full realization of the rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments.

Jamaica highlights that, in addition to being contrary to the principles of international law, unilateral coercive measures also contravene the principles of the sovereign equality of States, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and peaceful coexistence. Jamaica reiterates the call by the General Assembly urging all States that have applied and continue to apply such measures to take the necessary steps to repeal them as soon as possible.

Kuwait

[Original: Arabic]
[15 June 2012]

Human rights, enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and several other international instruments, and in most national constitutions, apply to relations between States and individuals and also to relations between States. All human rights must be upheld without exception or selection.

Kuwait supports all efforts by OHCHR in the rejection and elimination of unilateral coercive measures. Such measures have negative effects on the population of developing countries and development, as laid out in the Declaration on the Right to Development. They impede the full enjoyment of all human rights, including the most elementary rights such as those to food and medical care. They are used to exert political pressure and pose obstacles to international relations and trade.

Kuwait is opposed to the adoption of any legislative, administrative or economic measure by any State against any other State, in particular coercive measures used to enforce specific policies. Such measures may impede political, social and cultural progress in targeted States.

Kuwait believes that, to ensure respect for human rights, there should be no politicization of issues relating to human rights. Furthermore, the universality of human rights must be respected without selecting some rights and excluding others. Kuwait believes that it is important to perform a comprehensive assessment of resolution 66/156 to assess its current impact and the obstacles to its implementation and to take the necessary follow-up steps.

Mexico

[Original: Spanish]
[30 May 2012]

Mexico strongly rejects the application of legislation and unilateral measures of economic blockade, commercial or any other type of measures against any country, in addition to the use of coercive measures without legal basis in the Charter. In its view, political, economic and military sanctions can emanate only from the decisions and recommendations of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Mexico reiterates that unilateral measures implemented extraterritorially in third countries have humanitarian consequences. Furthermore, such measures represent a rejection of diplomacy and dialogue as the best ways to resolve disputes between States. On 23 October 1996, Mexico promulgated legislation to protect trade and investment from foreign norms that contravene international law with the aim of prohibiting the realization of acts that affect trade and investment when such acts are a consequence of the effects of the extraterritorial legislation of other countries.

Syrian Arab Republic

[Original: Arabic]
[24 May 2012]

The Syrian Arab Republic states that, every year, the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council adopt resolutions in which they emphasize that the imposition of unilateral economic measures on developing countries constitutes a flagrant violation of the norms of international law set out in the Charter. While the principles and purposes of the United Nations are unequivocal, as are the recommendations made by the General Assembly in the relevant resolutions, certain States and regional entities continue to use coercive measures against certain developing countries and to subject them to political pressure.

The Syrian Arab Republic stresses that a series of unilateral coercive measures is adversely affecting the Syrian people, their livelihood and development. It notes that the United States, the European Union, the League of Arab States, Turkey, Switzerland, Canada, Australia and Japan have all imposed illegal, unilateral coercive measures on the Syrian Arab Republic, stating that an exhaustive list of the harsh unilateral sanctions imposed to date, including those imposed by the above-mentioned countries and organizations, is contained in a note verbale dated 24 May 2012 (A/HRC/20/G/3).

Sanctions have recently been stepped up, with serious impacts on the Syrian people. The States in question have imposed more than 58 packages of illegal, unilateral coercive measures against the Syrian people, targeting all areas of economic, financial, agricultural and industrial activity and the food, pharmaceutical, tourism, transport, science and culture sectors. Each set of sanctions includes several subsets, so that the real number of sanctions is far higher than 58, with major implications for the scale of the suffering of the Syrian people.

Most of the measures have been focused on the oil, gas, financial, banking, electricity, technology and infrastructure sectors. They have had an extremely negative impact on the Syrian economy, which has been deprived of revenue from

those vital sectors and has sustained huge losses in terms of unrealized income. The oil sector alone has lost more than $2 billion during the current crisis because the export of some 180,000 barrels per day has been halted (excluding losses stemming from damage, bombings, sabotage and theft). That in turn has led to price hikes and had a knock-on effect on the income of Syrians, their day-to-day lives and the availability of health, educational and social services and employment.

The Syrian Arab Republic believes that the European Union has imposed harsher collective sanctions on the Syrian people. For example, the European Investment Bank has halted its funding of electricity generation projects, a purely civilian sector that serves the population, especially in the harsh winter season when people use electricity for heating to compensate for the fuel shortage. The European Union has also imposed sanctions on several officials in the electricity and oil ministries. The employees of those ministries work under extremely difficult conditions to repair the damage caused by armed terrorist groups to pipelines and oil and electricity sector infrastructure, while those groups seek to stop them from approaching destroyed facilities or kill, abduct, terrorize or beat them.

The Syrian Arab Republic also states that armed groups have destroyed electricity networks, depriving the population, hospitals and factories of that key utility. The sanctions on transportation have inflicted an embargo on the Syrian population: oil may not be transported to or from the Syrian Arab Republic in any vessel that flies the flags of the States concerned. This is but one example of the impact that unilateral resolutions have had on the lives of millions and the scale of the damage that they cause. Examples are also given of sanctions against a popular credit bank and a post office savings bank. Those banks are wholly and solely dedicated to serving the Syrian population. The freezing of assets belonging to the Real Estate Bank, which is an important source of financing for home purchases used by Syrian families with average or low incomes, is another example of a human rights violation, in this case the right to housing. The same applies to the industrial and agricultural banks, which lend to manufacturers and small farmers.

The Syrian Arab Republic also states that the sanctions are designed not to help the Syrian population, but to destabilize the economy, marginalize growing numbers of Syrians and subject them to collective punishment for failing to join schemes set up to destroy the Syrian Arab Republic.

The Syrian Arab Republic calls upon the international community to condemn those and other unilateral measures imposed on developing countries. It calls for the full and unconditional implementation of General Assembly resolution 66/156 and the rejection of the measures, which are used as instruments of political and economic coercion against developing countries and are employed to undermine the freedom of choice of those countries and their populations and to impoverish and marginalize States that refuse to yield to the hegemonic ambitions of others.

Trinidad and Tobago

[Original: English]
[5 July 2012]

Trinidad and Tobago states that unilateralism can be described as the doctrine that nations should conduct their foreign affairs on an individualistic and one-sided

basis without the advice or involvement of other nations. In the present context, it would refer to actions by individual Member States, exclusive of any consultation with or advice from governing bodies, which compel its citizenry to act in accordance therewith. Many developed States exercise unilateral coercive measures over developing countries, which are often dependent on those developed nations, as a means of economic and political control. Such intimidating measures place restrictions on the scope of trade and also on the ability of the developing countries to determine their own policies.

Trinidad and Tobago does not support the application of unilateral coercive measures within States, or their extraterritorial application. Trinidad and Tobago recalls five of the main United Nations conventions related to the above-mentioned resolution to which it is a party: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Trinidad and Tobago concludes that the provisions of those conventions highlight the need for greater respect for and recognition of human rights and liberties and are implemented either through legislation or social policy in Trinidad and Tobago. Accordingly, if unilateral coercive measures were to be in operation in Trinidad and Tobago, they would undoubtedly directly contravene article 5 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and articles 1 to 5 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

There are, to date, no recorded incidents of the application of unilateral coercive measures by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

III. Analysis and conclusions

3. **All Member States that responded rejected the use of unilateral coercive measures and several States noted that they did not resort to such measures as a matter of principle. It was said that unilateral coercive measures contravened the ideals of democratic States and the basic principles of State sovereignty, independence, sovereign equality, self-determination and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, and peaceful coexistence. Some respondents were of the opinion that unilateral coercive measures represented a rejection of diplomacy and dialogue as the most appropriate means to resolve disputes between States.**

4. **According to several respondents, unilateral coercive measures represented a violation of human rights and posed obstacles to the full realization of human rights, the development of societies, the achievement of peace and security and the resolution of disputes and conflicts. Interference with free trade took place at the expense of vulnerable populations in developing countries, including children, adolescents, women and older persons. Measures such as embargoes should be limited in time and should in no way affect innocent civilian populations.**

5. **Several States referred to the use of unilateral measures implemented extraterritorially in third countries, saying that such measures had humanitarian consequences and clearly contradicted the objectives for which those measures had been put in place.**

6. **Respondent States also noted that there was a need to raise public awareness of the negative impact of unilateral coercive measures and the importance of respecting the standards and principles of international law in order to create friendly relations between countries and promote and protect human rights. They observed that such measures were used as a tool for political or economic pressure against countries with opposing views, to prevent those countries from exercising their right to decide, of their own free will, their own political, economic and social systems and posed obstacles to international relations and trade.**